

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

- - -

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 12-md-02311  
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARIANNE O. BATTANI  
United States District Judge  
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse  
231 West Lafayette Boulevard  
Detroit, Michigan  
Wednesday, November 5, 2014

APPEARANCES:

**Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:**

DAVID H. FINK  
DARRYL BRESSACK  
**FINK & ASSOCIATES LAW**  
100 West Long Lake Road, Suite 111  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304  
(248) 971-2500

GREGORY P. HANSEL  
**PRETI, FLAHERTY, BELIVEAU & PACHIOS, L.L.P.**  
One City Center  
Portland, ME 04112  
(207) 791-3000

STEVEN A. KANNER  
**FREED, KANNER, LONDON & MILLEN, L.L.C.**  
2201 Waukegan Road, Suite 130  
Bannockburn, IL 60015  
(224) 632-4502

JOSEPH C. KOHN  
**KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.**  
One South Broad Street, Suite 2100  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(215) 238-1700

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 **Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:**

3 EUGENE A. SPECTOR  
4 **SPECTOR, ROSEMAN, KODROFF & WILLIS, P.C.**  
5 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500  
6 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
7 (215) 496-0300

8 **End-Payor Plaintiffs:**

9 ADAM T. SCHNATZ  
10 **THE MILLER LAW FIRM, P.C.**  
11 950 West University Drive, Suite 300  
12 Rochester, MI 48307  
13 (248) 841-2200

14 **For the Defendants:**

15 HARYLE KALDIS  
16 **WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE and DORR, L.L.P.**  
17 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
18 Washington, DC 20006  
19 (202) 663-6776

20 MATTHEW L. POWELL  
21 **KERR, RUSSELL & WEBER, P.L.C.**  
22 500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2500  
23 Detroit, MI 48226  
24 (313) 961-0200

25 A. PAUL VICTOR  
**WINSTON & STRAWN, L.L.P.**  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
(212) 294-4655

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1		
2		
3		
4	Settlement terms.....	6
5	Court's approval of settlement.....	14
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1

2 Detroit, Michigan

3 Wednesday, November 5, 2014

4 at about 11:01 a.m.

5

- - -

6 (Court and Counsel present; Mr. Victor present via  
7 telephone.)

8 THE CASE MANAGER: Please rise.

9 The United States District Court for the Eastern  
10 District of Michigan is now in session. All persons having  
11 business therein draw near, give attention, you shall be  
12 heard. God save these United States and this Honorable  
13 Court. The Honorable Marianne O. Battani presiding.

14 You may be seated.

15 THE COURT: Good morning.

16 ATTORNEYS PRESENT: (Collectively) Good morning.

17 MR. VICTOR: Yes, hello.

18 THE COURT: If you can't hear please say so.

19 MR. VICTOR: I can hear perfectly. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: Good morning, again, Counsel. May I  
21 have your appearances, please?22 MR. VICTOR: This is Paul Victor for Winston &  
23 Strawn for Nippon Seiki companies.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. VICTOR: Thank you, Your Honor, for permitting

1 me to do this by telephone.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MR. FINK: Your Honor, David Fink on behalf of  
4 direct-purchaser plaintiffs.

5 MR. KOHN: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph Kohn  
6 for direct-purchaser plaintiffs.

7 MR. HANSEL: Good morning, Your Honor. Greg Hansel  
8 on behalf of the direct purchasers.

9 MR. KANNER: Good morning, Your Honor. Steve  
10 Kanner on behalf of the direct purchasers.

11 MR. SPECTOR: Good morning, Your Honor.  
12 Gene Spector on behalf of the direct purchasers.

13 MR. POWELL: Good morning, Your Honor.  
14 Matthew Powell on behalf of the Nippon Seiki entities.

15 MR. KALDIS: Good morning, Your Honor.  
16 Harlyn Kaldis on behalf of Denso Corporation and Denso  
17 International America.

18 THE COURT: This is very interesting because  
19 plaintiffs are on the wrong side, right?

20 MR. FINK: That's correct, Your Honor.

21 MR. HANSEL: Yes.

22 THE COURT: All right. Well, this case is  
23 different. Mr. Powell, you're defendant, right? You look a  
24 little lonesome. Mr. Kaldis, you don't want to sit at  
25 counsel table?

1 MR. KALDIS: Sure.

2 THE COURT: All right. This is the date set for  
3 the final approval of the proposed settlement with Nippon,  
4 correct? Who is going to speak for the plaintiff?

5 MR. KOHN: I will, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kohn?

7 MR. KOHN: May it please the Court, Joseph Kohn  
8 from Kohn, Swift & Graf for the direct-purchaser plaintiffs.

9 Your Honor, on behalf of co-lead counsel and  
10 Mr. Fink, liaison counsel, we are very pleased to be here  
11 today on the final approval hearing of a settlement agreement  
12 between the direct purchasers and Nippon Seiki Company  
13 Limited, N.S. International Limited and New Sabina  
14 Industries, Inc., all the Nippon entities, settlement  
15 agreement dated April 3rd of this year.

16 We are here to request the Court to enter two  
17 orders, the first being the stipulated form of final judgment  
18 as to the Nippon entities, which would be a final dismissal  
19 with prejudice of those entities from the direct purchaser  
20 litigation, what we hope is the first of similar orders in  
21 this broader litigation.

22 The second is an order that we had requested with  
23 respect to the ability and the right to be able to withdraw a  
24 portion of the settlement fund for future litigation expenses  
25 related to the instrument panel cluster litigation.

1           For purposes of this record and more in the nature  
2 of administerial points, I want to place on the record that  
3 the Court entered an order on May 16th of this year granting  
4 preliminary approval to this settlement authorizing the  
5 notice to the class members and setting this hearing date.  
6 We filed the appropriate certification that the notices had  
7 been provided October 21st, which contained a declaration  
8 from the claims administrator certifying that class notice  
9 was mailed to over 200 entities that were identified by the  
10 defendants as their customers, their purchasers of these  
11 products. That was done on July 30th. The publication  
12 occurred in the Automotive News on August 4th and in the  
13 Wall Street Journal August 8th, all directed by your Court's  
14 prior order.

15           I do have paper copies of the proposed orders  
16 although I understand that they are also submitted  
17 electronically but if the Court requires --

18           THE COURT: I have a copy of them here.

19           MR. KOHN: Okay.

20           THE COURT: Let me just be clear on this, so you  
21 mailed to the individuals or companies that the defendant  
22 identified?

23           MR. KOHN: Not only this settling defendant but the  
24 other party defendants in this case, so they were all  
25 required to produce those records. We do keep them

1 confidential vis-a-vis the other defendant companies, their  
2 customers have some confidential basis so we don't generally  
3 file that entire list of who was mailed but it is available  
4 should the Court require.

5 THE COURT: Okay. And it was published and also I  
6 looked at a website that you had?

7 MR. KOHN: Correct, there is also a website that  
8 was created by the claims administrator.

9 THE COURT: How would people know about this  
10 website, I'm just curious?

11 MR. KOHN: It is referenced in the printed notices  
12 and people surf the web. The claims administrator advises  
13 there are only 250 what they call individual hits to the IPC  
14 settlement portion of the broader website that they have  
15 created. We haven't sort of -- but so it did get a fair  
16 amount of activity given the size of the class.

17 Your Honor, respectfully we do believe this is a  
18 milestone in the case. As I say, this will be the first  
19 final judgment of dismissal in this litigation. Your Honor  
20 may think given the number of defendants and the different  
21 plaintiff groups at this pace we'll be here in the year 2525  
22 as that old pop song went, but we think the pace is  
23 accelerating.

24 THE COURT: I hope so.

25 MR. KOHN: One of the factors we had cited in favor



1 of approval of the settlement with respect to the preliminary  
2 approval motion is the notion of an icebreaker settlement,  
3 and we think that has gone beyond the theoretical to the  
4 actual. There is a hearing set in December for two  
5 additional settlements with respect to the direct purchasers  
6 and final approval, and we would hope that this has proven to  
7 be an icebreaker and not as they say merely theoretical.

8 The standards for approval of a class settlement  
9 were set forth in detail --

10 THE COURT: Before you go -- excuse me. Before you  
11 go into those standards, there were two groups, you attached  
12 a list, I believe basically they were Ford and Honda who  
13 opted out of this class; is that correct?

14 MR. KOHN: Correct, and that was again pursuant to  
15 the procedures agreed in the agreement. They were attached  
16 to the proposed final judgment order indicating that they  
17 have elected to remove themselves from this settlement, they  
18 are not bound by the judgment but they don't share in the  
19 proceeds or the benefits either.

20 THE COURT: And there has been no other individual  
21 defendants, you have received no other letters or anything  
22 indicating a desire to opt out or other questions or anything  
23 like that?

24 MR. KOHN: Not at all, Your Honor, and that really  
25 in the anticipation in terms of looking at the standards that

1 was one of the factors that I wanted to take some time to  
2 highlight today, which is the reaction of the class --

3 THE COURT: Okay. You may proceed.

4 MR. KOHN: -- to a settlement.

5 And under Rule 23 approval of a settlement is not a  
6 majority rule vote, it is not a plebiscite. Theoretically a  
7 majority of the class members could oppose a settlement or  
8 object to it and the Court might still determine that it is  
9 fair and reasonable and adequate or vice versa, there could  
10 be no objection and the Court could still determine that it  
11 is not fair.

12 We believe this class is somewhat unique. It is a  
13 highly-sophisticated class of purchasers, it includes some of  
14 the largest corporations in the world. They have in-house  
15 counsel, they have access to outside counsel, they have  
16 access to antitrust specialists so that we really think this  
17 factor weighs very heavily in favor of approval more so than  
18 it would in a, quote, run of the mill kind of class action.

19 In some ways I would submit that factor subsumes a  
20 number of the other factors, for example, looking at the risk  
21 or duration of litigation. Well, those corporations, the  
22 Chryslers, the GMs, the Mercedes, the Nissans, understand  
23 risk of litigation, they understand how long it can take,  
24 they understand whether they could pursue a claim separately  
25 with respect to Nippon if they chose, and they analyzed this

1 and they made their decision to remain in the class.

2           The factor of experienced counsel negotiating at  
3 arm's length, they could evaluate that factor. We have had a  
4 great deal of discussion with a number of other counsel who  
5 either are in-house or outside counsel for some of those  
6 class members, and they were able to make that evaluation and  
7 that judgment as to whether this was in the best interest of  
8 the class and satisfied those kind of factors. They could  
9 have voted with their feet, as it were, and brought their own  
10 actions or filed an objection to the settlement had they  
11 chosen. They certainly had the wherewithal and the ability  
12 to understand the case and access to counsel who could have  
13 made whatever arguments they might have chosen to.

14           Your Honor will recall that the hearing not in  
15 instrument panel cluster but the wire harness, the first of  
16 the Twombly motions, and I stepped to the podium with all of  
17 my notes and all ready to go and prepared, and I think Your  
18 Honor asked me the first question, which is could you tell us  
19 who do you really represent, what is this direct purchaser  
20 class? And I think I tried my best to answer at that point  
21 but maybe now a couple years later we have sort of a  
22 deliverable, it is not a theory, it is a fact. With this  
23 final judgment -- proposed final judgment, should the Court  
24 enter it, it is a final judgment as to all direct purchasers  
25 other than the two opt-outs, other than Honda, which was

1 designated I think in the guilty pleas with the Government,  
2 with Nippon, and Ford, which has carved its own pathway in  
3 its litigation, but every other direct purchaser from the  
4 smaller assemblers and entities to, as I say, the Chryslers,  
5 GMs, Toyotas, Mercedes, et cetera, are bound by this judgment  
6 and are in this proposed settlement class for purposes of  
7 finality for these defendants.

8 We can also -- while the other settlements will be  
9 appropriately information about the opt-outs and the other  
10 settlements will be filed as we have here, we can give the  
11 Court a preview that there are similar or maybe even better  
12 results in terms of the opt out in the settlements that are  
13 going to be heard in December as well, and those will be  
14 filed soon under the schedule.

15 Your Honor, part of the final judgment order and  
16 the approval process is that the Court grant final approval  
17 to the settlement class or certification of the settlement  
18 class that was preliminarily granted in May, and we would  
19 request the Court to incorporate those findings that the  
20 Court did make in May. We have set forth in our brief the  
21 standards for class certification beginning page 18 of the  
22 brief we filed in September, certainly the scrap metal being  
23 a leading antitrust case in the 6th Circuit, the Packaged Ice  
24 case we also cited from this district, in terms of the  
25 finding that commonality exists in cases of horizontal price

1 fixing and the other 23(a) factors are also satisfied here.

2 So, Your Honor, we would request on behalf of all  
3 the parties, the settling defendants as well as the  
4 plaintiffs, that the Court approve the judgement in the form  
5 that was agreed upon by the parties. And many courts approve  
6 settlement on the basis of a judgment without writing a  
7 further memorandum -- or some do, some do not, but it is  
8 certainly appropriate that the settlements are simply  
9 approved and put to bed by virtue of the final judgement  
10 order.

11 With respect to the proposed order on the future  
12 cost expenditures, we are also happy to report there were no  
13 objections to that from any of these class members, the  
14 larger, sophisticated ones that I talked about. We cited --

15 THE COURT: That is at the set amount as stated in  
16 the order?

17 MR. KOHN: Yes, Your Honor, up to that would be a  
18 cap, it may be less.

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MR. KOHN: We did cite a number of cases beginning  
21 at pages 16 and 17 of our brief from coast to coast, from  
22 California to the New York isles, of courts that have  
23 approved those sorts of procedures for payment of expenses.  
24 Indeed, in some of the cases the court has approved that the  
25 entire amount of an early settlement can be used to fund

1 litigation expenses; we have not done that here, we have  
2 placed a cap that it would be no more than 20 percent of this  
3 settlement amount. Again, there has been no objections from  
4 any class members to that.

5 Again, if Your Honor has questions I would be happy  
6 to answer, otherwise we would respectfully request approval  
7 of the two orders as submitted, and I look forward to seeing  
8 you in December.

9 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kohn. Before I get to  
10 defense, Mr. Kohn speaks for everybody? Is there anyone who  
11 has any other comment?

12 MR. KANNER: No.

13 MR. SPECTOR: No.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Spector, you're sure?

15 MR. SPECTOR: Positive.

16 THE COURT: Okay. For defense, you're confusing me  
17 on this here.

18 MR. POWELL: We have nothing to add, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Nothing to add. Okay. I'm just going  
20 to highlight for purposes of the record some of the items  
21 that have been put forth. I appreciate the notices that have  
22 gone out, and this class has been defined as all persons or  
23 entities excluding defendants, their officers, directors and  
24 employees, as well as defendants' parents, predecessors,  
25 successors, subsidiaries and affiliates who purchase

1 instrument panel clusters in the United States, its  
2 territories and possessions, directly from any defendants,  
3 including settling defendants, or from any of the parents,  
4 predecessors, successors, subsidiaries or affiliates during  
5 the period from January 2001 up to and including the date the  
6 Court enters an order approving the proposed form and method  
7 of dissemination of notice.

8 I do want to specifically indicate, if I can find  
9 the order here, is that paragraph 8 in the order, I would  
10 like to for the record put that forth that the Court's  
11 certification, and this is agreed upon by the parties, that  
12 the Court's certification of the settlement class as provided  
13 herein is without prejudice to or waiver of the rights of any  
14 of the defendants to contest certification of any other class  
15 proposed in these coordinated actions, et cetera, so I just  
16 want to highlight that for purposes of the record.

17 The terms of the settlement here, the Court finds  
18 that Nippon Seiki will pay the money into an interest-bearing  
19 account, and the Court notes that the settlement amount is  
20 substantially larger than the fine that was paid in the  
21 criminal matter in this. Of course, in exchange for the  
22 settlement payment and cooperation, which is very important  
23 here, the plaintiffs and other members of the settlement  
24 class release the antitrust claims arising from the conduct  
25 alleged in the complaints.

1           Okay. Under Rule 23(e) it requires the Court to,  
2   of course, approve the proposed settlement. The settlement  
3   must be fair, reasonable and adequate, and of course there  
4   are any number of factors that go into that, and I would just  
5   briefly touch on those factors.

6           The first factor being the likelihood of success.  
7   Though plaintiffs are optimistic, of course, success is not  
8   guaranteed in any action, and defendant pled guilty to a  
9   shorter conspiracy period than what is in the settlement. I  
10   would indicate that certainly defendant is represented by  
11   competent counsel and I believe would be prepared to defend  
12   through trial and appeal if necessary, but these risks are  
13   weighed against the settlement amount of \$5.25 million and  
14   was mentioned here this morning that this is valuable also as  
15   an icebreaker and I do agree with that.

16           The complexity, expense and likely duration of  
17   continued litigation, I can't even foresee the likely  
18   duration of continued litigation. What did you mention, 2020  
19   or --

20           MR. FINK: 2525, Your Honor.

21           THE COURT: 2525.

22           MR. FINK: I should note Mr. Kohn didn't note one  
23   thing, if this trial goes through 2525 I just hope you will  
24   still be presiding and we'll all be here with you.

25           THE COURT: Right, wouldn't that be nice? Okay.



1 But certainly it is complex, just by their nature antitrust  
2 claims are complex, very expensive. I think we can see that  
3 already by the amount of time and counsels' fees alone  
4 without even considering the costs, the actual out-of-pocket  
5 costs, that these types of cases require and that were spent,  
6 in fact, in this case. So it certainly eliminates the  
7 expense and delay with respect to a recovery from the  
8 defendant.

9 The judgment of experienced counsel, I have said  
10 this before and I just want to repeat, the Court is very  
11 impressed with all counsel for both sides in this case and  
12 truly relies on it, and I think given your -- each of  
13 counsel's past experiences, which I don't have to go over,  
14 and what they have showed the Court in this litigation tells  
15 me that since they believe -- counsel believes a settlement  
16 is fair and reasonable the Court has no reason to believe  
17 that it is not.

18 I do like the other comment that was made today,  
19 which I guess I really hadn't considered before, that the  
20 defendants, and I'm sure the defendant here too, that they  
21 have their own counsel and I imagine -- maybe I'm reaching  
22 here, I don't know, but I think the counsel for these large  
23 corporations must be very good counsel and that they not only  
24 have their litigation counsel here but their own in-house  
25 counsel to advise them.

1           The Court further notes that there has been no  
2       objection raised by other class members as to the 20 percent  
3       of the settlement fund for litigation expenses, and as to the  
4       actual settlement there had been just two exclusions, which  
5       we've mentioned today, there is a list attached to the  
6       judgment, they are basically Honda and Ford and various  
7       entities associated or part of Honda and Ford.

8           It's believed by the Court that the settlement  
9       class counsel has extensive experience in class-action  
10      antitrust cases and other complex cases and that this  
11      settlement was negotiated at arm's length. And certainly the  
12      other factor the Court has to consider of course is the  
13      public interest, and it is I believe almost always in the  
14      public's interest to resolve litigation with a positive known  
15      outcome. So given the fact that these suits are notoriously  
16      difficult and unpredictable, I think the public is well  
17      served by the resolution of this matter.

18          Okay. The next thing I should comment on I think  
19      the notice and was the notice proper, and the Court read the  
20      notice, I know it was mailed, I asked a few questions about  
21      that, and apparently everybody received it, there were some  
22      duplicates. It is kind of unusual because here we had direct  
23      mailings to people or entities that we know were involved in  
24      this litigation, so along with the newspaper and the website  
25      I think that notice was properly and clearly indicated.

1           As I indicated already, the 20 percent funds I will  
2 approve. Oh, the settlement class, the settlement class I  
3 think should be finally approved by this Court under Rule 23.  
4 Certainly numerosity is an issue with 200, almost 300  
5 individual plaintiffs who are all over the country. It  
6 appears that given the number and the geographical  
7 distribution that joinder is impracticable.

8           Commonality, as we have said before, in  
9 anti-price-fixing conspiracy cases by their nature deal with  
10 common, legal and factual issues about the existence, scope  
11 and effect of the alleged conspiracy.

12           Typicality, to satisfy this claim so the  
13 representative parties must be typical of the claims. Here  
14 typicality is satisfied because the individual plaintiffs'  
15 injuries arise from the same wrong that is allegedly injuring  
16 the class as a whole in that they were all victims of the  
17 same conspiracy.

18           Next, the adequacy of representation. The Court  
19 looks at the representation by the individual plaintiffs and  
20 also the representation by counsel, and here the  
21 representative plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect  
22 the interest of the class because the individual plaintiffs  
23 have the same interest as other class members. In addition,  
24 class counsel is qualified, experienced and able to conduct  
25 litigation.

1           In terms of whether the plaintiffs meet the  
2 requirements -- additional requirements of 23(b)(3), that  
3 class members demonstrate that common questions predominate  
4 over questions affecting only individual members and class  
5 resolution is superior. The claims involve a single global  
6 conspiracy from which all proposed settlement class members'  
7 injuries arise. Evidence shows a violation as to one  
8 settlement class member is common to the class and will  
9 provide the violation to all.

10           So finally a class action the Court believes is the  
11 superior method to adjudicate these claims, and I believe all  
12 of Rule 23 has been satisfied here, and that the class should  
13 be finally certified, and the Court will so certify. The  
14 Court will approve the proposed settlement and will sign the  
15 order for the 20 percent or the \$1,050,000 for the expenses  
16 incurred.

17           Although I do have one question here, Mr. Kohn,  
18 when you were talking about the expenses you said for future  
19 expenses, so these are going for the continued litigation of  
20 this as opposed to past?

21           MR. KOHN: Right. We wanted to make it clear that  
22 we were not purporting to draw down some of that money to  
23 reimburse the money that counsel has already expended on the  
24 IPC cases for the translations, for the filing of the  
25 complaints, et cetera.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MR. KOHN: Thank you.

3 THE COURT: All right. Anything else that the  
4 court needs to do that I haven't done or mentioned?

5 (No response.)

6 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. This is our first  
7 final approval, wonderful. Thank you very much.

8 MR. VICTOR: Thank you.

9 MR. KANNER: We will see you on December 3rd for  
10 two more.

11 THE COURT: Wonderful.

12 MR. KOHN: Do a balloon drop like we have on  
13 election night.

14 (Proceedings concluded at 11:28 a.m.)

15 — — —

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  

CERTIFICATION

I, Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter of the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript taken in the matter of Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 12-02311, on Wednesday, November 5, 2014.

s/Robert L. Smith  
Robert L. Smith, RPR, CSR 5098  
Federal Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Michigan

Date: 11/12/2014  
Detroit, Michigan